



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,731	10/10/2000	William L. Eason	0544MH-40021	7126

7590 08/13/2004

Christopher W. Kennerly Esq.  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue  
Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, MARC D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2144

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/686,731

Applicant(s)

EASON ET AL.

Examiner

Marc D. Thompson

Art Unit

2144

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 21 June 2004 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Best Available Copy**

MARC D. THOMPSON  
MARC THOMPSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The arguments presented in this request for reconsideration are not considered persuasive. Examiner stands firm on the validity of the statutory basis of rejection. Examiner further disagrees with the Applicant characterization of the applied prior art and the narrow reading of the constructive elements of said system, particularly in view of the breadth of the claimed and disclosed invention. Any distinction between the "view controller", as claimed, and the disclosed "view Configurer" as disclosed in the teachings of Bowman/Amuah is unclear, and further, if a difference is assumed to be present, this difference is considered by Examiner to be within the skill set of one with ordinary skill in the art (obvious) at the time of invention, as previously stated. Further, any notion of "encapsulation" of functional "business logic" programmed code inside (as a part of new) functional element(s) which define logical attributes for end-user presentation was fully understood by ordinary artisans at the time of filing, was directly suggested in the teachings of Bowman-Amuah, and was widely implemented in typical object-oriented technologies in the prior art. The amendment will be entered in order to remedy the typographical error present in claim 2, and does not change scope of the claimed invention.

MARC D. THOMPSON  
MDT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Best Available Copy